UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2965
5 December 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 5 December 1990, at 11 a.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TÖRNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61525/A 3706V (E)

best copy available

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of December, I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute, on behalf of the Council, to His Excellency Mr. Thomas R. Pickering, Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, for his service as President of the Security Council for the month of November 1990. I am sure I speak for all members of the Security Council in expressing deep appreciation to Ambassador Pickering for the great diplomatic skill and unfailing courtesy with which he conducted the Council's business last month.

On behalf of the Council I should like also to express deep appreciation to His Excellency Mr. James A. Baker III, Secretary of State of the United States of America, for having presided over the work of the Council at its important 2963rd meeting, at which so many Foreign Ministers were present.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 26 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF YEMEN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21830)

REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH RESOLUTION 672 (1990) (S/21919 and Corr.1 and S/21919/Add.1-3)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Egypt, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan,

(The President)

Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

I welcome Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State of Palestine, and invite him to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bendjama (Algeria), Mr. Mohiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Moussa (Egypt), Mr. Menon (India), Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Al-Anbari (Iraq), Mr. Aridor (Israel), Mr. Salah (Jordan), Mr. Al-Sabah (Kuwait), Mr. Makkawi (Lebanon), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Ould Mohamed Mahmoud (Mauritania), Mr. Hasbi (Morocco), Mr. Umer (Pakistan), Mr. Al-Nimah (Qatar), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Ali (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Ghezal (Tunisia), Mr. Aksin (Turkey), Mr. Al-Shaali (United Arab Emirates) and Mr. Silovic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; Mr. Kaddoumi (Palestine) took a place at the Council table.

READEX FICHE

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/21949, which contains the text of a letter dated 19 November 1990 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Observer Mission of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, and document S/21958, which contains the text of a letter dated 23 November 1990 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): May I begin, Sir, by welcoming you on your assumption of the Chair and saying that we look forward to your presiding over the Council's meetings with that skill and wit that we have come to associate with all your activities in the Council.

At the same time, I wish to pay a tribute to the Permanent Representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Pickering, for the outstanding way in which he presided over the Council last month, culminating in his preparation of the historic meeting of the Council held last Thursday.

On the matter before us, I should like to begin by complimenting the Secretary-General and his staff for their very thorough and careful work in preparing the report called for in resolution 672 (1990). It is all the more commendable, given Israel's deeply regrettable refusal to receive the Secretary-General's mission when that report was being prepared. At least there has been some progress since then, in that Israel has now invited Mr. Aime to visit Israel and the occupied territories. We hope that he will travel soon, and we look forward to hearing his views.

I do not wish to dwell at length on individual incidents in the occupied territories. These are covered in detail in the three addenda to the

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

Secretary-General's report, and the Security Council took a clear position on the events of 8 October in adopting resolution 672 (1990). We are all too familiar with the unhappy chain of violence in the occupied territories. We must now look forward rather than back, and focus on what steps can be taken to protect Palestinian civilians in the occupied territories.

The Secretary-General's report puts forward some interesting ideas on this. His suggestion that the Security Council might wish to call for a meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Fourth Geneva Convention merits careful study. This is a new approach that has not been tried before. It is a recurrent theme of resolutions of this Council that the Fourth Geneva Convention applies to the occupied territories and that Israel must abide by its obligations under it. This is a matter to which my Government, along with its partners in the European Community, attaches the greatest importance. The point was reiterated in the declaration on the Middle East adopted by the European Council in Rome as recently as 27 and 28 October.

We feel that the prospect of a meeting of the High Contracting Parties would send a powerful signal to Israel that it should take the greatest care over its treatment of the Palestinian citizens under its control. It would demonstrate the concern of the whole international community over what is happening in the occupied territories.

The Secretary-General also refers in his report to Palestinian appeals for an impartial presence, properly mandated by the United Nations. This idea obviously needs to be given greater clarity before any decision can be taken. The Secretary-General's report (S/19443) of 21 January 1988 was one possible source of suggestions in this way. In addition, my authorities would be prepared to examine ideas which involved the extension of the work of the United Nations humanitarian

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

agencies working in the occupied territories, always provided that this would not in practice impede them in the performance of their main humanitarian tasks.

Whatever steps the Council decides to take, my authorities believe we should be aiming for realistic measures - ones that will have a tangible effect on improving the lives and protection of the Palestinian civilians in the occupied territories. We should be thinking in terms not of political gestures, but of practical results. We must not embrace ideas that stand no chance of being implemented. There is no point in pursuing courses that end in deadlock; that does nothing for the standing of the Council and nothing to improve the situation on the ground.

However, practical measures to protect the Palestinian civilians in the occupied territories, important though they may be, are not an end in themselves. They can only be, at best, a temporary palliative. We must never lose sight of the need to find a solution to the Arab-Israel problem as a whole. The preamble to resolution 672 (1990) reaffirms that a just and lasting solution must be based on resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) through an active negotiating process that takes into account the right to security of all States in the region, including Israel, as well as the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people. My Government supports this view wholeheartedly. As the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Douglas Hurd, told the House of Commons on 24 October, the Palestinians have the right to self-determination, and that right can be expressed only in the context of a negotiated settlement, which must also include provision for the security of Israel within secure borders.

In the Queen's speech at the opening of the new session of the British Parliament on 7 November Her Majesty said:

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

"My Government will continue to work for long-term peace in the Middle East, including a settlement of the Palestinian problem".

That is a clear and firm commitment for the year ahead.

The British Government reiterates its support for the principle of the convening, at an appropriate time, of an international peace conference. We believe that the establishment of a dialogue between Israel and representative Palestinians would be an important first step to reactivate the peace process.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. LI Daoyu (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I have pleasure, Sir, in congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I am convinced that your rich experience and diplomatic talent will facilitate the accomplishment of the heavy tasks of the Council this month.

I should also like to express my thanks to Ambassador Thomas Pickering, Permament Representative of the United States to the United Nations, whose outstanding efforts in leading the Council to the fulfilment of its work last month impressed us.

The tense situation in the occupied Palestinian territory has all along been of grave concern to the international community. The Secretary-General, on the basis of resolution 672 (1990), has submitted a report which is both practical and of positive significance, and has put forward reasonable recommendations. The Chinese delegation wishes to express its appreciation and thanks to the Secretary-General for his unremitting efforts to relax the tense situation in the occupied territories, protect the Palestinian residents and promote the peace process in the Middle East.

(Mr. Li Daoyu, China)

It is regrettable, however, that the Israeli Government has persisted in its negative position, and has refused to accept resolutions 672 (1990) and 673 (1990) and receive the mission sent by the Secretary-General. Furthermore, the Israeli occupying authorities have intensified their efforts to suppress the Palestinian residents in the occupied territories, which resulted in the recent killing and wounding of several hundred people in the Gaza Strip. We condemn the Israeli authorities for these acts and call on the Israeli Government to change its attitude, earnestly fulfil its obligations stipulated in Article 25 of the United Nations Charter and sincerely implement the relevant Security Council resolutions.

(Mr. Li Daoyu, China)

To date the Government of Israel has steadfastly refused to accept the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the occupied territories, and announces that Jerusalem is the sovereign capital of the State of Israel. I wish to point out that the series of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, including Security Council resolutions 476 (1980) and 478 (1980), have confirmed the applicability of that Convention to Jerusalem. Any legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by the Government of Israel in violation of those resolutions and in any attempt to change the character and status of Jerusalem are illegal, null and void and should be rescinded.

The Chinese delegation supports any recommendations conducive to the protection of the safety of the Palestinian residents in the occupied territories, including those put forward by the Secretary-General in his report. Under the provisions of article 1 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, all of the signatories have the obligation to respect and to ensure respect for the Convention. In this situation, where the Convention has been repeatedly violated, we support the convening of a meeting of its signatories in order to take the necessary and effective measures to ensure that the Convention is respected. The dispatch by the Security Council of United Nations monitoring personnel to the occupied territories will help to guarantee the safety of the Palestinian residents.

Finally, I wish to reiterate that the alleviation of the sufferings of the Palestinian people and the protection of their safety are not tantamount to the fundamental solution of the question of Palestine. The Security Council, which bears the main responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, should play its due role in seeking a fair and reasonable settlement of the Palestine question. We continue to support the convening of an international conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of the five permanent members of the Security Council and all

(Mr. Li Daoyu, China)

parties to the conflict, with a view to achieving a comprehensive and just solution to the Palestinian question. China is willing to continue to work with other States for the realization of this noble aim.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of China for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. VORONTSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I take this opportunity to welcome you, Sir, as President of the Security Council and to wish you success in your work in that post. I should also like to express our sincerest gratitude to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the United States, Mr. Thomas Pickering, for his skilful work in November. We also welcome the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Palestine, Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, who is participating in our meeting of the Security Council here today.

Recent events in the occupied Palestinian territories have once again focused the attention of the Security Council on the dangerous situation in the Middle East. These tragic events did not come about by chance. They are a logical consequence of the policy carried out by Israel of reinforcing its occupation of Arab lands, of crushing the national aspirations of the Palestinian people and of offending their religious sensitivities. Evidence of this is shown in the shootings of unarmed Palestinians on 8 October 1990 on the Temple Mount, which served as a trigger for a new wave of violence that swept over the occupied territories. Despite the resistance of Israel, which refused to co-operate with the Security Council, and which blocked the arrival to the region of a mission to investigate the events that had taken place, the Secretary-General was able, in accordance with resolution 672 (1990), to prepare a substantive report, which reaffirms that confrontation in this region has reached extreme limits. Taking

(Mr. Vorontsov, USSR)

advantage of this opportunity, I should like to express to the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, and to the Secretariat staff our sincere gratitude for the efforts undertaken. This document, in concentrated form, gives an exhaustive picture of the actions taken by the Council from the outset of the intifadah in the search for ways to alleviate the plight of the Palestinians in the occupied territories. It contains a number of practical recommendations aimed at overcoming barriers of confrontation and distrust and at ensuring compliance by Israel with its commitments under the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. The report also objectively depicts the profound historical tragedy now being experienced by the Palestinian people.

The full picture was supplemented by the statement of the Permanent Representative of Palestine to the United Nations, Mr. Al-Kidwa, and was also seen on the videotape shown in this Chamber, which clearly left no one indifferent. I should like, with particular satisfaction, to emphasize that the position of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) presented to the Security Council, in our view, contains numerous concrete and practical proposals demonstrating the flexibility and variety of approaches formulated by the Palestinians in order to resolve the problem. We fully share the point of view expressed that the United Nations and the Security Council must take urgent action to protect the Palestinian people in the occupied territories.

In this regard, we cannot ignore the statement made by the representative of Israel to the Security Council on 7 November, which showed that his Government has not abandoned the badly outdated negativist position, which is not in keeping with new trends in the world and runs counter to the aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations. By rejecting resolutions 672 (1990) and 673 (1990), the Government of Israel is refusing to accept the

(Mr. Vorontsov, USSR)

reasonable and realistic proposals of the Secretary-General. The Security Council cannot accept the chronically obstructionist position of Israel.

A process of renewal is taking place in the world today. Problems have been or are being successfully resolved which, for many years, defied solution. People are looking at the most complex international issues in a fresh light. It is high time, and it has long been high time, for Israel to bring its policy into line with the realities of today's world.

We are convinced that present circumstances require urgent steps on the part of all interested States, on a bilateral and multilateral basis, to actively implement the peace-making potential of the United Nations and the Security Council which, from the very outset, has played a fundamental role in Middle Eastern affairs. In the eyes of the international community, resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) continue to retain their fundamental importance for an Arab-Israeli settlement.

(Mr. Vorontsov, USSR)

I would recall that in February 1989, in a statement in Cairo, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Eduard Shevardnadze, advanced a comprehensive concept for improving the situation in the Middle East. This included increased efforts to convene an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, and the permanent members of the Security Council. That concept is valid today. The Soviet Union favours a varied approach to stimulating the peace process in the Middle East and is prepared to support any constructive proposals, including interim ones, that are linked to the achievement of a comprehensive settlement. We continue to believe that, along with efforts to establish and launch a negotiating process for the settlement of the underlying causes of the Middle East crisis, steps should be taken to reduce regional tension, strengthen trust and lower the level of military confrontation.

A timely start on work towards convening a peace conference would help to avoid a new, dangerous stage in the evolution of the situation and to begin to move towards a search for a solution to the problems of the Middle East based on a balance of interests, the principles of civilized relations among States and high standards of humanism and non-violence.

The Soviet Union continues to believe that the following elements are basic to any solution to the conflict: first, acceptance of the territorial basis for a settlement set out in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which provides for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all territories occupied in 1967; secondly, recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination to the same extent as it exists for the people of Israel; and, thirdly, observance of the right of all parties to the conflict to a peaceful and secure existence within

(Mr. Vorontsov, USSR)

internationally recognized boundaries and of the principles of equality, equal security, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, respect for political independence and sovereignty, and the non-use of force.

The Soviet Union shares the conviction of the majority of members of the international community that ultimately practical steps will have to be taken to convene an international conference on the Middle East. We are convinced that Israel's agreement to the convening of such a conference could have a positive impact on the situation in the region.

I take this opportunity to call upon all concerned, and first and foremost the Government of Israel, finally to heed the voice of reason and logic.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that the decision of the Security Council following its discussion of the question of the situation in the occupied territories will be a step towards the achievement of a settlement and a lasting peace in the Middle East and towards guaranteeing the rights of the Palestinian people.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Palestine. I once again welcome to our midst Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Palestine, and invite him to make his statement.

Mr. KADDOUMI (Palestine)(interpretation from Arabic): It gives me great pleasure at the outset, Sir, to extend my heartfelt congratulations to you, my dear brother Ambassador Abdalla Al-Ashtal, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council, not only because of the close ties of friendship that bind us and because you are an illustrious son of the brother Arab people of Yemen, but also because of your universally recognized qualities of leadership, wisdom and sound

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

judgement. I am confident that you will conduct the work of the Council in such a way as to ensure the success of its deliberations.

I would like to thank the President of the Council for last month, Ambassador Thomas Pickering, for his guidance of the Council's work. I wish also to extend profound thanks and sincere greetings to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, and to commend him highly for his consistent efforts in the service of international peace and security and his continuous monitoring of unresolved questions with a view to finding possible solutions. We appreciate also his report on the provision of the necessary protection for the Palestinian people in the occupied territories.

The Security Council meets today, as it has on several occasions in recent weeks, to discuss a definite and clear-cut question, namely, the provision of protection and security for a people that is daily exposed to extremely serious crimes, crimes that have become a systematic pattern of Israeli policy towards the Palestinian people.

I take this opportunity to thank our friends, Yemen, Cuba, Malaysia and Colombia, for all the efforts they have made in support of our delegation and to enable us to submit the necessary information to the Council. I must also mention the support of other friendly States and thank them for the solidarity they have demonstrated, notwithstanding all the pressures brought to bear upon them.

I need hardly repeat here the salient, well-known facts concerning the terroristic Israeli practices against the Palestinian people in occupied Palestine. The Israeli file is before the Council and is replete with terrifying examples of such practices, which reached their peak in the massacre at the holy sanctuary of Al-Haram Al-Shareef in Jerusalem. That massacre was the direct reason for the series of meetings of the Council over the past month. However, the

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

Council has been meeting for years in an attempt to find ways to put an end to this terrible tragedy. It has adopted many resolutions affirming the need to apply the provisions of the Geneva Conventions and calling upon Israel to comply with them.

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

However, all these calls and appeals fell on deaf ears. Israel, with complete impunity, reacted to these calls and appeals with indifference and arrogant rejection. And why should not Israel behave in this manner which runs counter to all international norms, laws and values, when it is certain that a major Power, namely the United States of America, is sure to protect it from any sanction through the exercise of the right of veto?

That is why the meetings of the Council follow on the heels of each other in such rapid succession as if the Council were in a hopeless vicious circle, in search of the required solution to the question of finding the appropriate means of protecting our entire Palestinian people from a non-stop series of acts of aggression that has continued without interruption since the beginning of Israeli occupation, or rather since the inception of Israel itself. This has been made abundantly clear by the posture of the United States delegation, which prevented the Council from voting on the draft resolution before it all last month.

The entire world has noted with great satisfaction that the winds of international change are now blowing in the direction of enhancing the prestige of the international Organization, and in particular the Security Council. We all know the magnitude of the action the Council could take if it had the firm resolve to do so and was governed by a spirit of unanimity and not obstructed by the unwarranted exercise of the right of veto. Hence, why does the question of Palestine seem to be an exception? The entire international community rejects and condemns the occupation, recognizes the right of all peoples to self-determination and respects the rights of every State to live in peace and security within internationally recognized boundaries. Why then do we see in the Council that these principles and standards that apply to all do not apply to the people of Palestine alone? Has our people come from another planet, or is it different from all the other peoples of the world?

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

Undeterred, Israel occupies and annexes Arab and Palestinian territories with impunity. Israel murders; Israel arrests; Israel demolishes homes; Israel carries out raids; Israel burns farms and crops, and plunders waters with impunity. Not only this, but Israel, as the Council has heard from its Prime Minister, promises further expansion and occupation, again with impunity.

What is the reason for all of this? Once more, the only answer to this bitter question is the posture of the United States of America, which protects Israel and its criminal practices. This is the reason why we, alongside world public opinion, find that the double standard applied by the Security Council has come to threaten its credibility and prestige and to cast doubt on its ability to play the role that is expected of it in our new world, namely the upholding of right and justice over might and self-interest.

How much longer must this tragedy continue? It is a tragedy because, as the Council can see for itself, those who comply with United Nations resolutions, its Charter and its principles are punished, made prey to torture and murder, displaced and deprived of their most fundamental human rights, while those who reject those resolutions and defy those principles are rewarded with more support and assistance, and even with more encouragement to persist in their inhuman, immoral and aggressive policies.

The spirit of the draft resolution before the Council, which we have done our utmost to amend so as to command the unanimity of the Council's members, aims at ensuring the protection of our people and preserving its very existence, while Israel threatens to annihilate our people and expel them across the seas or across the river.

Hence, we hope that the draft resolution will elicit the desired agreement so that the sons of our Palestinian people, who look to the Council at these times,

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

will discern a glimmer of hope about the ability of the Organization to discharge its role in safeguarding peace and eschewing war.

We call upon the Council to establish a permanent presence of the United Nations and its personnel in the occupied Palestinian territories, within the context of an established mechanism that would monitor the situation and submit periodic reports thereon to the Council.

This is the bare minimum that the Council should undertake to provide international protection to the people of Palestine under Israeli occupation. We hope that the Council will bring its material and moral weight to bear in order to put an end to the crimes of Israel and the challenges with which it faces our people and the Council's resolutions so that we may not be left with the only option available, which is the legitimate response of self-defence with all the means approved by international norms and instruments.

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

We are not claiming a right that is not ours. We are not pleading for a position which runs counter to any legitimate human right or any one principle of the United Nations principles. What we are calling for is a legitimate right, and the Council is the source of its legitimacy. Hence, the Council is responsible for implementing it.

Will the Council measure up to those principles of which it is the custodian, and will it measure up to the powers invested in it?

In conclusion, may I say that the day that this Council is able to establish justice in the question of Palestine, it will not be our people only who will have been liberated and victorious, but surely this august Council also will have been liberated and victorious.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Palestine for the kind words he addressed to me.

There are no further speakers on my list for this meeting. As we agreed in the course of our informal consultations, the next meeting of the Security Council to continue the consideration of the item on its agenda will take place tomorrow, Thursday, at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2966
8 December 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Saturday, 8 December 1990, at 9 p.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. KIRSCH
	China	Mr. JIN Yongjian
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TÖRNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61531/A 3825V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 9.10 p.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I have been informed by the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations of the passing, on 6 December 1990, of Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra, the first Prime Minister of Malaysia. I should like, on behalf of the Council, to express profound condolences to the Government and people of Malaysia on their great loss.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 26 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF YEMEN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21830)

REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH RESOLUTION 672 (1990) (S/21919 and Corr.1 and S/21919/Add.1-3)

Mr. VORONTSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the interest of getting a decision by the Security Council on an important issue, namely, the defence of Palestinian civilians in the occupied territories, I officially move, under rule 33.3 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, that we adjourn this meeting and meet again at 3 p.m. on Monday, 10 December.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of the USSR has proposed, in accordance with rule 33.3 of the provisional rules of procedure, the postponement of this meeting until Monday at 3 p.m.

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and the members of the Council, on whose behalf you have spoken, for the tribute you have just paid and the respect you have shown to the late first Prime Minister of Malaysia. I shall convey the sentiments of the Council to his widow and to the Government of Malaysia. I thank you indeed for that tribute.

I have no option but to oppose the motion of the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union. On the surface it may appear to be a very simple, reasonable motion, but we are talking about a matter that has been in the hands of the Council for nearly two months. We are talking about a subject that has had the benefit of discussion on paper for several days, perhaps even weeks, if one takes into account the efforts before this month.

This motion is an attempt to buy time, but for what reason? If the motion is to buy time in order to bring about a consensus on a draft resolution, it can be

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

supported. But to my mind, if we accept this motion, it will mean further dilution of what is already a very balanced text - that of the draft resolution in document S/21933/Rev.2. I should like the Council to bear in mind the arduous efforts of the sponsors and other members of the Council who have drafted the text. We have now submitted the draft resolution to the Council for decision because we see no other way of giving it further consideration.

I do not want to repeat the debate we have just had in the informal meeting, but my delegation and the sponsors, which I represent, wish the Council to proceed to consideration of the draft resolution. I can think of no other means of supporting the Palestinians on the issue before us than by considering the draft resolution now before us. To my way of thinking, any debate would dilute the draft resolution of and serve the purpose of removing an important paragraph of the text. We would then be forced to take out operative paragraph 7 and consider it separately from the draft resolution as a whole. The sponsors of the draft resolution and the Palestinian delegation are very firm in their conviction that operative paragraph 7 is an integral part of the draft resolution.

I appeal to members of the Council to understand what the request for a postponement is all about. It is not to work towards a different formulation of paragraph 7; it is to work towards the exclusion of paragraph 7, in the interest of the position of an important member of the Council.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): I wish to address the motion put before the Council by the representative of the Soviet Union.

First, I assure Council members that we wish to continue with the good-faith efforts at negotiation which have been undertaken and have continued for the last four days to reach a mutually acceptable text. In that sense, we are ready to begin as soon as members of the Council are ready to see that happen. We have come

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

quite a long way in that process of negotiation over these four days; members of the Council are aware of the details from documents that have been circulated this evening. I want to say how much I appreciate the efforts of the representative of Malaysia in bringing that text along.

We believe, however, that the peremptory cut-off this afternoon of the process of negotiation by the sponsors on behalf of the party they represent was not warranted or justified. It came after the United States had made a number of what we believe to be useful and helpful proposals, proposals which were neither addressed nor responded to in the process. We therefore believe that the request for additional time addressed to the Council by the representative of the Soviet Union is not only a valuable but a potentially useful step, and we will, of course, support the motion.

Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I would not have wished it to be at the beginning of a debate of this nature, Sir, that I would be congratulating you and your country on your assumption of the Presidency of the Council for this month. We are all aware of your ability as a diplomat and your qualities as an exceptional human being and an indefatigible worker. After your 20 years with the United Nations, many people can testify to this.

I should like also to thank Ambassador Pickering for his successful efforts as President of the Council last month.

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

I wish to associate myself with the statement made by Ambassador Razali on the point under discussion. We are convinced that it is not really a question of four days of negotiations: more than a month has passed since a draft resolution was submitted; more than 15 days have passed since we requested a meeting of the Security Council to consider that draft resolution formally. At the request of some members of the Council, we agreed to a postponement of the consideration of the draft resolution until after 29 November.

So this is not a new draft resolution. It is not a draft resolution that could have taken anyone by surprise. Hence, I think that the message we are sending and shall continue to send if we postpone consideration of this draft resolution is not a very appropriate message.

Therefore, I should like to request members of the Council to join us in voting against the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Colombia for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Although we are in the midst of an apparently procedural discussion, I should like to discharge the very pleasant duty of congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of December and of stating that we are sure that under your leadership the Council will be able to act in keeping with the goals and standards that should guide it.

I should also like to express our gratitude to Ambassador Pickering for the way in which he conducted the Council's work last month.

I wish first to thank the representative of the Soviet Union for having brought to the Council's attention the existence of its provisional rules of procedure. We all recall that for one month several members of the Council attempted - in vain - to remind everyone that this document existed and that

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

the presidency of the Council should act in accordance with it. At one point we even felt guilty that we had dared to refer to the document, which in these new times would appear to have a somewhat subversive character. Therefore, we find it a very healthy sign that the Security Council is now openly availing itself of the norms and mechanisms that must be the sole guidance for its action - rather than capriciousness or arbitrariness.

Having said that, I wish to point out that the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union appears to be legitimate, for any member of the Council has the right to put forward any motion in accordance with the established rules. It is the same right that we four countries had when two weeks ago we asked the President to convene a meeting - which indeed has not yet been convened - to consider the draft resolution that is before us.

In any event, when the records of the Council are prepared, some minor adjustments may have to be made in them. I think that when the motion was made we had just adopted the agenda and, therefore, had just dealt with the first item - Adoption of the agenda. Mr. President, I did not hear you state that we were about to take up the second item - The situation in the occupied Arab territories. Undoubtedly, had you done so - as will be seen from the notes prepared by the Secretariat - you would have referred to the documentation that the Council has before it; and you would have reminded us of previous decisions taken by the Council to invite the representative of Palestine to take a place at the Council table and various other representatives who are seated here to do what they usually do at these meetings and have not had an opportunity to do now - that is, take a place at the side of the Council Chamber.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

That clarification having been made, my delegation agrees with what has been said by the representatives of Malaysia and Colombia. Indeed, one need only glance quickly at the text of the draft resolution to see that it is the result of a lengthy process of consultations and negotiations. It would have the Council do something in connection with what was openly stated a little more than two months ago in this very Chamber - namely, take action promptly on the Secretary-General's report.

The Council has not been excessively slow in taking rather dramatic decisions, or decisions that could have very serious consequences for mankind. But with regard to this issue it has worked at a leisurely pace that is in obvious contrast to that other approach, so often praised in this Chamber.

I think it would be quite inaccurate to attempt in this meeting to give anyone the idea that there had not in fact been an intensive process of consultations and that a flexible stand had not been taken by the sponsors of the draft resolution. The history of this document, its various wordings and the points of view expressed by other delegations make it clear that such an attempt would be inaccurate. My delegation feels that the Council should have acted some time ago. If we are here on this Saturday, it is precisely because of our flexibility and our desire to meet the wishes of other delegations.

My delegation will vote against the motion that has been made because, quite frankly, we fear that at 3 p.m. on Monday we shall come face to face with a situation that will be quite similar to the one we witnessed in our efforts throughout November as well as this week - namely, resistance to having this body discharge its duty vis-à-vis the Palestinian people in terms that are far from excessive, indeed that are, if anything, too generous when compared to the problem

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

involved and that are not at all like the strong language and tone of other resolutions of this very Council on the same subject.

But perhaps we shall have an opportunity to say more about this at some future date - perhaps on Monday, if the Council adopts the motion put forward, or else during this very complicated process of informal consultations which some would wish to use in order to bury key issues that the Council should, on the contrary, air in public.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Cuba for the kind words he addressed to me.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): I have asked to speak in order to support the motion put forward by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I am doing so because I regard this motion as not a motion for delay but a motion for taking action. The purpose of setting a time for a Council meeting on Monday is to allow the process of negotiation, which is under way within the Council and which was broken off this afternoon, to continue and come to a satisfactory conclusion.

It is on that basis that my delegation supports it, and I hope very much that all members of the Council will co-operate in ensuring that we do not arrive, as the representative of Cuba said we might, in the same state on Monday as we are now. Frankly, any delegation which takes the responsibility for ensuring that we arrive in the same state as we have now bears a heavy responsibility. My delegation will wish to use the period between now and then to negotiate on a text we can all support.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, although this is a procedural discussion, perhaps you will allow me, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. Aware of your talents, your diplomatic skills and your knowledge of the United Nations system, and given that you have already presided over the Council, we are quite sure that you will very ably discharge your tasks and that the Council will reap the fruits of your experience.

I should also like to extend my thanks and appreciation to Ambassador Thomas Pickering for the outstanding manner in which he presided over the work of the Council in the month of November. I think that the ministerial debate we held in the Council, which enabled us to take a historic decision on the invasion of Kuwait, testifies to the competence and the determination with which he guided our work during the month of November.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

We are engaged in a discussion, although rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure states quite clearly that when a procedural motion is made the matter will be decided without debate. Rule 33 is quite precise on this and perhaps I might even read it out:

"The following motions shall have precedence in the order named over all principal motions and draft resolutions relative to the subject before the meeting",

and then, at the end, it says:

"Any motion for the suspension or for the simple adjournment of the meeting shall be decided without debate".

Accordingly, my delegation expected that the proposal made by the representative of the USSR would immediately be put to the vote. We are a little surprised that a discussion is now being held on this question.

Having said that, and since other delegations have had an opportunity to state their views, I too would like to state that my delegation supports the proposal made by the representative of the USSR that the meeting be deferred until Monday, so as to enable the continuation of the consultations which have begun - consultations which have already enabled the parties involved to arrive at certain compromises on certain points and in which some agreements have been arrived at. Therefore, to the extent that such compromises may enable the Council to take a decision in a spirit of unanimity, I believe that this is an opportunity being given the Council to enable the parties involved to continue their consultations. Since the day is Saturday and the meeting would not be held until Monday at 3 p.m., as proposed by the representative of the USSR, it would allow time for the various parties to continue their consultations. Accordingly, my delegation supports the proposal made by the representative of the USSR.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Zaire for the kind words he addressed to me.

Before calling on the next speaker on the list, I should like to explain that, from the standpoint of procedure, we are speaking here of rule 33, point 3, which reads as follows: "To adjourn the meeting to a certain day or hour". That is why we can have a debate under this point 3. There could have been no discussion if a motion had been made to suspend the meeting or adjourn it for an hour or two. This is only to clarify the matter.

Mr. KIRSCH (Canada) (interpretation from French): Allow me on behalf of my delegation to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. Considering your personal qualities and experience, we are convinced, as we have already seen, that the Council cannot but benefit from your guidance in carrying out its work.

I should also like to congratulate Ambassador Pickering for the excellent manner in which he presided over the Council last month.

My delegation is of the view that the Council would be seriously mistaken were it to take a decision today on a draft resolution on which it is clear that additional consultations are needed before a decision is taken by this Council in a satisfactory manner. We believe that it is important to continue the negotiations which have begun and to continue them in a constructive spirit without prejudging their outcome.

We shall therefore support the motion presented by the representative of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Canada for the kind words he addressed to me.

Are there any other speakers?

(The President)

Since that is not the case, I shall now put to the vote the proposal to adjourn the meeting until Monday at 3 p.m.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Finland, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: Colombia, Cuba, Malaysia, Yemen

Abstaining: China, France

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The result of the voting is as follows: 9 votes in favour, 4 against and 2 abstentions. The proposal by the USSR has been adopted.

Accordingly, the next meeting of the Security Council will be held on Monday at 3 p.m.

(The President)

Before adjourning the meeting I wish to make a short statement on behalf of my delegation. We hope that the postponement that has been decided upon by the Council will help the Council to reach agreement on the draft resolution by unanimity, since the issue under consideration is extremely grave and important. While the Council has been busy over the last four months with the Gulf crisis, it has before it now this other crisis of which it has been seized for over 40 years. Therefore, we hope that the negotiations will lead to a consensus. I believe that at this juncture, I have to explain, so that it will be clear to all, why my delegation voted, in addition to the other members, against the proposal to postpone the meeting.

Certain events took place on 8 October this year in Al-Quds which claimed the lives of 20 Palestinians. The Secretary-General then presented his report on 31 October. On 8 November we had the first version of the draft resolution whose last version we have before us now; on 26 November the first amended version was put forward, and today the Council has before it the second amended version. The Council will notice that there is a great difference between the final version and the first one as a result of the spirit of co-operation and concession displayed by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

We should not confuse this issue with any other issue under consideration. My delegation has made clear right from the start that we cannot limit our consideration to the single issue of the protection and safety of the Palestinians, because if we go down that road we shall have made the occupation a permanent fact. To undo part of the injustice done to the Palestinians by protecting them is only a first step and a temporary measure towards resolving the Palestinian problem and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Therefore, my delegation insisted in particular on

(The President)

mentioning Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) in all the drafts that have been put forward. My delegation also made a point of persistently mentioning the occupation and the entire crisis in all its aspects.

We have no wish to link the one crisis, in the Gulf to the other, in the Middle East. I want to stress that. What we want to do, however, is to link the issue of protection to the issue of occupation. We do not accept the separation of the issue of protection from the issue of occupation, because to freeze the issue of occupation would only mean, as I said before, the entrenchment of the present situation for many years to come. Furthermore, there is another linkage we wish to make. We want to link Israel to the Security Council. The question that begs an answer is: why is it that this State, of all the States of the world, is the one that never acquiesces in, agrees to or complies with Security Council resolutions? It did not even accept to receive one delegation from the Security Council.

In view of these considerations, we call upon - and demand of - the big Powers, especially the United States of America and the Soviet Union, to work towards a solution to this problem without considering any other problems.

In all modesty, we wish to state the following: we deal with two issues as parallel issues and not as interlinked issues. We have to seek to achieve a parallel solution. To speak of linkage in order to avoid addressing a chronic problem, is indeed tantamount to freezing that chronic problem, and this is unacceptable to us.

I now resume my functions as President.

Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I just want to state for the record that the Council has decided to meet again on Monday at 3 p.m. Eastern Standard Time to consider what it had before it for consideration

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

today - that is, the draft resolution submitted by four States in connection with the occupied territories. If, later on, someone wishes to create complications regarding this text, it will have to be done here, publicly. My delegation cannot accept the invention of new informal machinery, in an attempt to avoid what the Council has just decided upon publicly and openly. We are all called upon to meet in this Chamber on Monday at 3 p.m.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): At the outset I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of your important office for this month. Given your very wide diplomatic experience and skill in dealing with many of the issues under consideration we are convinced that the work of the Council will be successful.

I should also like to express the appreciation of my delegation to Ambassador Pickering of the United States for the remarkable manner in which he handled the work of the Council last month.

For the record I should like to state that my delegation views the proposal initiated by the representative of the USSR, upon which we have just voted as only a procedural motion. We have adopted it without prejudice to the outcome of the negotiations and the fate of any of the paragraphs and their content. It is the conviction of my delegation that we can take this as an expression of added effort to arrive at a unified position and to obtain much broader support for the text under consideration. We believe this will further assist us in addressing not just the short-term concerns but the ultimate interests of the Palestinian people. Therefore, my delegation differs with any suggestion or implication that the vote on adjournment reflects on the substance of the text and the positions of delegations on the concerns it addresses.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Ethiopia for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): Mr. President, I understand that we have decided to adjourn, and I should like to make two non-substantive points, if I may, very briefly.

First, in the heat of the moment, and perhaps to avoid in any way at all prejudicing your vote on the question, I failed to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency, which I do now, whole-heartedly - the more so to make up for my oversight.

Secondly, I understood that in our informal meeting we agreed that we would hold another informal meeting following this formal meeting. Since I did not hear you say that, I wonder if that is indeed the proposal.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words he addressed to me.

I intended to say before we adjourned that we would meet again this evening in the other room for informal consultations, as requested by the United Kingdom.

The meeting rose at 9.50 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2967
10 December 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 10 December 1990, at 3 p.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Colombia	Mrs. CASTAÑO
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TÖRNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61537/A 4127V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 26 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF YEMEN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21830)

REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH RESOLUTION 672 (1990) (S/21919 and Corr.1 and S/21919/Add.1-3)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): This meeting is being held pursuant to the decision adopted by the Council at its previous meeting. Given the desire to continue the informal consultations, and after consulting Council members, I propose to suspend this meeting until 7 this evening in order to give us enough time to continue negotiations in the hope of concluding them successfully.

If there is no objection, I shall suspend the meeting until 7 this evening.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): I have no objection to your motion, but I do wish to add a slight qualification to what you have said.

I regret that it was not possible, as I had asked, to have a discussion in informal consultations so that we could be a little bit clearer about the basis both of the postponement and of the reality of the time-limit that you are now setting.

But since we have not had that discussion and, therefore, I am not in a position to judge the reality of the time-limit you are now setting, I just wish to say that my delegation at least would not exclude the possibility that it will be necessary, at the time that you are now setting, to consider a further postponement.

I think it is a pity that I have to make this statement now. I would rather have made it in informal consultations.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): Are there other comments? Since that does not appear to be the case, I take it that members agree to the suspension of the meeting until 7 this evening.

The meeting was suspended at 3.55 p.m. and resumed at 7.40 p.m.

Mr. VORONTSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In order to give the Government of the Soviet Union and, as we understand it, the Governments of a number of other member countries of the Security Council the opportunity to have the necessary contacts with the Governments of the States most concerned, and to find a solution to the important question of the protection of the Palestinian population in the occupied territories, I formally move, pursuant to rule 33.3 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, that we adjourn the meeting, and designate a new meeting on Wednesday, 12 December, at 6 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of the USSR has proposed, in accordance with rule 33.3 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the postponement of this meeting until Wednesday at 6 p.m.

Before putting this proposal to the vote, I shall call on representatives wishing to make statements. I shall not call on anyone in explanation of vote after the voting.

Under the rules of procedure, speakers may be called on only before the vote.

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): With respect, considering how exhausted all members of the Council are, I have again, on behalf of the sponsors, to oppose the motion from the representative of the USSR.

You will remember that the sponsors opposed a similar motion last Saturday, because then, as we explained, the gap between the United States position and the position of the sponsors and, I dare say, of the other members of the Council, was very wide indeed.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

However, then, the Council, in its wisdom, decided to accept the motion of the representative of the USSR. Therefore, we accepted the verdict of the Council, and attempts were made under your auspices, under your guidance, to discuss again with the parties concerned. Yesterday, you had put together what we thought was a text which, as a package agreement, could well have found agreement all around. That was my understanding. That text went even further than what had been put in the second revision.

But that proved not to be the case. Since this morning, we have still had to contend with an insistence on a presidential statement, and there is still firm insistence that there should be no reference to Jerusalem, as well as an attempt to dilute the language and the content of paragraphs 5 and 6, which are important.

I do not want to go beyond procedure, but, for the record, let me say that the reference to Jerusalem is something that the sponsors cannot negotiate away. The fact that there is no reference to Jerusalem in resolution 672 (1990) is an exception that must not be repeated ever again. Jerusalem - and here I am speaking not only as a sponsor - is the spiritual, inspirational heart of Muslims. Since Israel's annexation of and horrible attempt to make Jerusalem its capital, there is not a single individual Muslim, I think, or a Muslim country, that would accept now, in this context, to have Jerusalem not referred to in this draft resolution.

I hope to goodness this is well understood by those who oppose a reference to Jerusalem in the draft resolution. For the record, too, let me say that the sponsors have made the maximum concession on the international conference. We have offered, in what may be called "revision 3", if ever that revision clears the surface, to transpose paragraph 7 into the preamble and what is in the preamble into the operative part; this is a maximum concession that in may ways diluted many things on the matter of the international conference.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

Also for the record, we have worked ourselves to the bone on the formulation of paragraph 5 and paragraph 6. In our estimation, at least 13 or perhaps 14 members of the Council are in a position to vote on the draft resolution in document S/21933/Rev.2.

We do not want to be portrayed as the inflexible foe standing in the way of a consensus. The bottom line is: What do the Palestinians want? Have we asked them what they want? We have the Palestinian delegation here. I have spoken to them; you have spoken to them. Can we ask them what they want? Clearly, some of us have not done this or have not wanted to listen to what they say.

In that context, and without prolonging this, I have, again, with respect, to oppose the postponement that has been requested, for in accepting it we would again be delaying and doing a great disservice to the Palestinians.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): I have just a few brief words to offer. We have been negotiating intensively since Saturday night. Several useful new ideas have emerged on the scene, and we were continuing intensively today - indeed, we had three meetings. At the third meeting, those of us who were continuing with the negotiations expected to provide further thoughts and to hear further thoughts from the other side on precisely how these ideas might be spelled out and incorporated in the text. Unfortunately, at 5.30 tonight, we were once again told peremptorily that it was time to cut off the negotiations, that there was no further work that could be done, that the process had to move to a vote straight away tonight.

We were told, in fact, that we could take a draft that was presented to us several days before and on which we had made numerous suggestions, or we could leave it and go back to the second revision - either one we wanted. Neither, of course, are fully acceptable, but we are, and will continue to be, prepared to work

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

on this process. We believe serious progress has been made. We believe, as a result of the first two meetings which we had this morning, that further serious progress can be made, and we believe that further time is worthwhile, and for that reason my delegation will support the motion of the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation did not intend to speak on this occasion since the representative of Malaysia, as he just said, was going to do that on behalf of the four countries which presented the draft resolution to this Council. However, I have to express my delegation's rejection of the new attempt to present the position of the sponsors with respect to this draft resolution as if it were one of inflexibility and an attempt to impose peremptory time-limits on members of the Council.

It is ironic, to say the least, that in this same Chamber we are being told by the same delegation that convened not only the representatives whose duty it is to remain in New York permanently to ensure the continuous operation of the Council but also our Ministers to come at a given day and hour to vote on a draft resolution which, we all know, was not available to members of the Council until 48 hours before the day on which it was put to the vote.

What the Council has before it now would not authorize anyone to use military force; not bring the world to the brink of war; not imply any violation of the spirit or letter of the Charter of our Organization. This draft resolution would simply try to ensure that the Council were consistent with its own words - this Council which promised to take prompt action with respect to the report presented by the Secretary-General on the situation in the occupied territories including Jerusalem.

For more than one month we have been feverishly involved in lengthy, patient consultations with all the members of the Council. As Ambassador Razali recalled, the discussion basically centred on two main points: first, the idea of a peace conference on the Middle East, which was not invented yesterday or emerged after August this year, for, as we all know, it has existed in the international

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

community for several years now; and, second, the clear inclusion of Jerusalem in the text of the draft resolution.

Jerusalem was not left out of other resolutions adopted by this very Council; I have several of them here with me. This one, which was adopted 10 years ago here mentions the Holy City of Jerusalem as one of the territories occupied by Israel illegally; it does so four times in the preamble and three times in the operative part. I know that this resolution was adopted unanimously. I was not here at the time, but surely the five permanent members were, and I suppose they voted in favour, otherwise it would not have been adopted unanimously.

There are many others. Some were adopted with 14 votes and a United States abstention, such as resolution 476 (1980), adopted more than 10 years ago, which mentions Jerusalem eight times in this context. Paragraph 6 of this resolution says:

> "Reaffirms its determination, in the event of non-compliance by Israel with the present resolution, to examine practical ways and means in accordance with relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations to secure the full implementation of the present resolution". (resolution 476 (1980))

Ten years ago none of the four sponsors was a member of the Council, but the permanent members certainly were. The latter and others - a total of 14; there was an abstention - approved the text I have just quoted. Was the Council serious when it reaffirmed this determination 10 years ago, if today it is not even in a position to adopt, after one month and a half of negotiations, draft resolution S/21933/Rev.2? I think it is clear to the whole world who is holding up the work of the Council and whose positions are inflexible.

You said, Mr. President, that there could not be explanations of vote after the voting. Of course, that is the case if we assume that we are going to repeat Saturday's experience. If the Council decides to suspend the meeting that will

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

have to be the case on the immediate announcement of the vote, if it is favourable. Therefore, I want to say now what I said on Saturday. If the motion presented by the representative of the Soviet Union were approved, this Council would be deciding to meet here again on Wednesday at 6 p.m. to consider this draft resolution. That decision by the Council cannot be changed by informal consultations or even secret ones; if it is taken here openly, then the next meeting will be here, and here the same delaying tactics will be repeated or, finally, a decision will be taken on the draft resolution we are sponsoring.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): As you know, I spoke in the very brief discussion this afternoon to the question of whether we really had allowed enough time for further negotiation, so I am not entirely surprised to hear that that was not the case. I am surprised to hear that the said negotiation did not take place at all, but of course since we have not had the opportunity to discuss in informal session what has been passing in this period since the Saturday meeting that we had, when we decided to adjourn in order to allow more time for consultations, I am at some disadvantage to know which version of the events put before the Council is in fact the correct one. I hope that that mistake will not be made on a future occasion, because I think if members of the Council are to take views on this matter they need to know what they are taking the views on. We have rather been deprived of that opportunity now.

I bitterly regret the tone of the intervention of the representative of Cuba. I think statements that say before a further period of negotiation has been undertaken that representatives are not prepared to negotiate at all are not the way to conduct the business of this Council in a fruitful way. But I welcome the proposal by the representative of the Soviet Union, for which I shall vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): Are there any other speakers? Since that is not the case, I shall now put the motion by the Soviet Union to the vote, that is the proposal to adjourn the meeting until Wednesday, 12 December, at 6 p.m., for the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Finland, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zaire

Against: Colombia, Cuba, Malaysia, Yemen

Abstaining: China, France

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The result of the voting is as follows: 9 votes in favour, 4 against and 2 abstentions. The proposal has been adopted. The Security Council will meet on Wednesday, 12 December, at 6 p.m.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the members of the Security Council that the Security Council will meet in informal consultations immediately following the adjournment of this meeting, in accordance with the request of one of the members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2968
12 December 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 12 December 1990, at 6 p.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TÖRNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. LOZINSKY
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61555/A 4200V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 8.15 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 26 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF YEMEN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21830)

REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH RESOLUTION 672 (1990) (S/21919 and Corr.1 and S/21919/Add.1-3)

Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the light of information on the course of the consultations regarding the draft resolution before the Council and on negotiations at the political level that have taken place recently, the Soviet delegation would like to propose that, under rule 33.3 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, the meeting be adjourned to Monday, 17 December 1990, at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of the Soviet Union has moved the postponement of the meeting to Monday, 17 December 1990. at 3 p.m., in accordance with rule 33.3 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. I shall now put to the vote the motion by the Soviet Union, that the meeting be adjourned to Monday, 17 December, at 3 p.m.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Finland, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: Colombia, Cuba, Malaysia, Yemen

Abstaining: China, France

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The result of the voting is as follows: 9 votes in favour, 4 against and 2 abstentions. The motion is adopted.

The meeting rose at 8.20 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2969
14 December 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 14 December 1990, at 4 p.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. KIRSCH
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TÖRNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. REDZUAN
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61567/A 4253V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN CYPRUS (S/21981 and Add.1)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mavrommatis (Cyprus), Mr. Exarchos (Greece) and Mr. Aksin (Turkey) took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to recall that in the course of the Council's consultations members of the Council agreed that an invitation should be extended to Mr. Ozer Koray in accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to invite Mr. Koray in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the appropriate moment, I shall invite Mr. Koray to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

(The President)

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus for the period from 1 June 1990 to 30 November 1990, document S/21981 and Addendum 1.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/22000, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/21996, which contains the text of a letter dated 12 December 1990 from the Permanent Representatives of Australia, Austria, Denmark, Ireland and Sweden to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear an objection, I shall put the draft resolution (S/22000) to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements on the draft resolution before the voting.

Mr. KIRSCH (Canada): Let me begin my remarks this afternoon by reaffirming in no uncertain terms our continuing commitment to the United Nations Peace-keeping Force (UNFICYP) in Cyprus.

As the Council is aware, we have been contributing both troops and money to UNFICYP since its inception in 1964. In the years since UNFICYP was created, thousands of men and women have served this Organization in one of its noblest responsibilities - peace-keeping. Just this week Canada informed the Secretary-General that we shall continue our participation in UNFICYP at current levels if the Security Council renews its mandate this afternoon.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

As a troop contributor of long standing, both to UNFICYP and to other United Nations peace-keeping operations, we remain convinced that such operations are vital in promoting the peaceful resolution of seemingly intractable conflicts. In the case of Cyprus, there can be no doubt that UNFICYP has helped to maintain the peace on that divided island. In so doing, UNFICYP is helping the Secretary-General carry out his mission of good offices in the search for a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem.

I believe that view is shared by the rest of the members of the Council, who on 61 occasions since 1964 have voted to renew UNFICYP's mandate.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

Canada is proud to have been associated with the Force since its creation. We are also proud of the dedication of the men and women from many countries who have served the United Nations with great distinction in Cyprus. We are pleased to see the Force Commander, Major-General Clive Milner, in the Council this afternoon, and we wish him success in his difficult but important task.

Peace-keeping is an expensive operation, in terms of both lives lost and moneys spent. From the early days of UNFICYP to the middle of this year 149 men and women had died in the service of the United Nations in Cyprus, while many more had been hurt or wounded. They made the ultimate sacrifice in the search for peace, and we pay a tribute to them and remember them.

It is estimated that the total cost of the United Nations Force in Cyprus that has been absorbed by the troop-contributing countries since 1964 exceeds $2 billion. Meanwhile, the costs borne by the United Nations are to be financed through a system of voluntary contributions that is unique to UNFICYP among all peace-keeping operations - and there is little wonder that it is unique to that Force. The voluntary contributions to UNFICYP are consistently insufficient to meet the United Nations portion of the costs of the Force. As a result the troop-contributing nations, including Canada, are obliged to bear an inordinately heavy share of those costs. The Secretary-General has on numerous occasions expressed concern about the unhealthy financial situation of UNFICYP and has urged that a system of assessed contributions replace the voluntary fund.

Since joining the Security Council in January 1989 Canada has been working to correct the financing difficulties facing UNFICYP. After two years of negotiation and discussion we and some other members of the Security Council have circulated a draft resolution that would finally place the financing of UNFICYP on a more sound and secure basis through the use of assessed contributions.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

As members know, it had been our intention to have the draft resolution voted upon this afternoon at this meeting of the Council. We believe that the time has come to deal with this matter. Nevertheless, at the request of a few of the members of the Council, including one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, we have asked that the voting be postponed until next week to allow time for further consultations.

My delegation made it clear to the members of the Council on a number of occasions that we viewed the financing of UNFICYP as of major importance and, should the financial crisis facing the Force not be dealt with before the next renewal of its mandate, Canada reserved the right to abstain on that renewal. Since we have delayed consideration of our draft resolution to next week, it is clear that the financial crisis of UNFICYP has not been dealt with before the mandate renewal meeting. As a result Canada will indeed abstain on the mandate renewal. We do this with reluctance, but in all good conscience.

The Security Council has expressed the view, through the statement of its President on 30 May 1990, that peace-keeping operations must be launched and maintained on a sound and secure financial basis. The Security Council also expressed its concern - at the last mandate renewal meeting, in June of this year - about the chronic and ever-deepening financial crisis facing UNFICYP.

The time has come to solve the crisis. That is the intention of our draft resolution on UNFICYP financing. We hope that when our draft resolution is put to the vote next week the members of the Security Council will adopt it. By so doing they will be underlining their continuing commitment to the important role UNFICYP plays in the search for a peaceful solution in Cyprus, a commitment that Canada has already made and continues to make every day that our troops serve the cause of peace on that island.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Council will now vote on the draft resolution in document S/22000.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Canada

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The result of the voting is as follows: 14 votes in favour, none against and 1 abstention. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 680 (1990).

I call on the representative of Cyprus.

Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus): I take this opportunity at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on the assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. We are particularly pleased to see the presidency of the Council in the capable hands of the Permanent Representative of a friendly country that symbolizes unity and with which we maintain excellent relations.

I would also like to express appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Thomas Pickering, the Permanent Representative of the United States of America, for the very able and skilful manner in which he steered the work of the Council in November, a very important month in the history of the United Nations.

Moreover, I wish to express thanks and appreciation to all the members of the Security Council not only for the unanimous adoption of the resolution renewing for for a further period of six-months the mandate of UNFICYP and that of the Secretary-General's mission of good offices, as well as for the keen interest in the solution of the Cyprus problem exhibited throughout this year, often in the form of decisions or statements aimed at removing obstacles in the path of

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

dialogue, obstacles that were and are undermining the very basis and even the existence of the talks.

We welcome the resolution just adopted and reiterate our pledge of full co-operation with the Secretary-General and with UNFICYP.

Once again we wish to express our appreciation and gratitude to the Secretary-General for his indefatigable, constant and consistent efforts to promote a just and viable solution to our problem. His patience and perseverance in the face of obstructions and obstacles, which during the last 15 months have become the order of the day, are admirable.

I also extend our thanks to the Force Commander, General Clive Milner, and his officers and men, and to Ambassador Oscar Camilión, Mr. Virendra Dayal, Mr. Marrack Goulding, Mr. Gustave Feissel and Mr. Giandomenico Picco.

The Government of Cyprus has always been preoccupied with the chronic financial problem of UNFICYP, which has persisted in spite of repeated calls by the Secretary-General for contributions and the patience of troop- or police-contributing countries, to which we again express our sincere gratitude.

This is why Cyprus, although keeping a low profile on the whole issue, cannot but express sympathy with the Canadian initiative and hope for a quick consensus draft resolution, taking into consideration that the presence of UNFICYP is the direct result of the continuation of a serious international problem, as observed by the Secretary-General in his report (S/21981 and Add.1), in recommending to the Security Council the extension of the mandate of the Force.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

Moreover, the Secretary-General sets out in the report that I have mentioned - paragraph 44 - the conclusions of the Secretariat review team that he dispatched in November to examine the operations and organization of UNFICYP. It is clear that UNFICYP, while carrying out its mandate in an efficacious manner, is stretched to the limit.

In the light of circumstances prevailing in Cyprus owing to the continuing Turkish occupation of the areas of the republic of Cyprus, the situation in those areas - in particular, the Karpas peninsula - and the plight of those enclaved, it must be underlined that any possible reduction of the Force should not reduce its effectiveness.

I take this opportunity to welcome the reopening of the liaison post at Leonarisso, in accordance with the Vienna III Agreement, and urge UNFICYP to assist in applying vigorously this humanitarian agreement, which is being grossly violated.

We have no doubt that the Secretary-General, when discussing the implementation of the team's findings and recommendations with the UNFICYP troop contributors, will ensure that the force is enabled to maintain its effective capability, which is so necessary if it is to carry out its mandate.

We have reached the end of yet another six-month review period not only without any tangible results at hand but also with the prospects of achieving even the slightest progress towards a negotiated solution to the Cyprus problem rather dim and disheartening.

Threats to further colonize Cyprus, continuous obstacles, intransigent statements, conditions and pre-conditions, untenable claims disputing the agreed basis of the negotiations and, recently, even a provocative volte-face in respect of the type of solution we have been seeking have not only polluted the negotiating environment but have also cast serious doubts on the bona fides of the other side.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

The illegal visits of the Prime Minister and, more recently, the Foreign Minister of Turkey to the occupied part of Cyprus, branded by the Turkish Government as "official visits" to the secessionist Turkish Cypriot State, were new and serious provocations, constituting blatant violations of Security Council resolution 541 (1983) and, more notably, of Security Council resolution 550 (1984).

These violations do not end with the mere act of the "official visits"; they go much further, with the publicly declared intention contained in the joint declaration and the agreed minutes of the talks held in occupied Cyprus between the Turkish Premier and the "Prime Minister" of the Turkish Cypriot régime. They agreed to pursue "practical measures" to strengthen the illegal Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and to promote it at the international level.

As if this were not enough, further serious disregard of the appeals of both the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, who repeatedly called on the parties concerned

> "to refrain, especially at this sensitive stage, from any action or statement that would aggravate the situation",

was evidenced more recently.

In a new wave of provocative statements, emanating from the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr. Denktash, and other members of his partitionist régime, there is an ominous message of hardening intransigence and disappointing retrogression towards untenable positions, which were unequivocally condemned and expressly excluded from the negotiating process by the Secretary-General himself and by Security Council resolution 649 (1990), which was adopted earlier this year.

In making such statements, the Turkish side returns to the already-rejected thesis of "two peoples" and their "separate rights to self-determination" and, still worse, proceeds to new levels of astonishing absurdity in explicitly demanding

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

recognition of a separatist and universally condemned entity as a pre-condition for the resumption of the talks.

The situation acquired such alarming proportions that it prompted the President of Cyprus, on 30 November last, to address a letter to the Secretary-General warning that these statements did not augur well for the success of his mission and that the necessary influence should be exerted to safeguard respect for the resolutions of the Security Council and the agreed basis of the talks as a sine qua non for progress.

Such statements included the threatened colonization of the fenced area of Varosha - justifying our earlier warning that the purported change of the special status of that area by allegedly handing over control to the illegal régime not only was a prelude to colonization, but also provided Turkey with a false alibi.

Prompt action by the Government of Cyprus and the international community again averted colonization, and it was more than heartening to note that the Secretary-General, in paragraph 17 of his report, which is before the Council, stresses that the United Nations considers the Government of Turkey responsible for maintaining the status quo in the fenced area of Varosha.

It is obvious, therefore, that the views, positions and actions of the Turkish side are not in conformity with the new spirit of international relations brought about by a sweeping democratization process in Europe and elsewhere and enhanced by the resolve that, after the Gulf crisis, aggression should be dealt with effectively.

We the Cypriots, like everybody else, shared with the German people their joy and enthusiasm with regard to the unification of their country, the more because we are fully aware - and very sensitive at that - of what the yearning for unification means, living, as we have done, for the last sixteen and a half years in a country divided by force of arms.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

The Cyprus question is an international problem of invasion and occupation, whose solution is long overdue. Cyprus cannot remain an anachronism in Europe, being the only European country with a large part of its territory under foreign military occupation, with its citizens denied the exercise of their fundamental freedoms and basic human rights, its demographic structure altered through the massive implantation of imported settlers, and with 1,619 persons missing, persons whose fate has not yet been ascertained despite the fact that many of them were known to be alive in the hands of the occupying Power after the cessation of hostilities in 1974.

I could not complete my statement without a further brief reference to recent developments, which, in the case of the continuing tragedy of Cyprus, entail hope for the oppressed Cypriots and a stern warning for the Turkish oppressor.

I could begin with Europe - not only the Europe of the Twelve that has, time and again and at all levels, made it abundantly clear that there is no justification for any State to occupy another State, but also the Europe of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which, at the Paris summit meeting last month, heard the Secretary-General so aptly refer to the Cyprus problem.

What began in 1975 with the Helsinki Final Act as a mere enunciation and elaboration of the Decalogue of Principles that should govern international relations in Europe has developed into practical measures and mechanisms that ensure the translation into action of all that has been agreed to date. Therefore, the days when Turkish accountability for violations of principles and for its continued presence in Cyprus was hedged by the East-West confrontation are gone, and account they shall in Europe - sooner than they think.

I now turn to the grave situation in the Persian Gulf, created by the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq. Turkey is toeing the line of the international

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

community, complying with measures taken and hypocritically applauding both the resolve of nations and the resolutions of the Security Council, knowing well that the same yardstick, the same considerations and the same principles as underlie the resolutions on Kuwait are equally applicable to other problems, and particularly to Cyprus.

The Gulf crisis shall end in the not-so-distant future, and this Council will have to take up these other problems, including Cyprus, with the same vigour, with the same resolve, and shall apply - let there be no doubt about it - the very same principles.

The President of Cyprus, by his letter to the Secretary-General, has already invited the Security Council to play a more active role in the quest for a solution to the Cyprus problem by promoting the implementation of its own relevant resolutions.

Therefore, the days of the Turkish occupation of Cypriot soil must be numbered. If the Turkish side entertained any doubts, a mere reading of the record of the historic meeting of the Security Council on 29 November last, under the presidency of the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Baker, should dispel them.

Permit me to end by quoting a passage from Mr. Baker's statement at that meeting:

> "With the cold war behind us, we now have the chance to build the world which was envisioned by the founders of this Organization - by the founders of the United Nations. We have the chance to make this Security Council and this United Nations true instruments for peace and for justice across the globe. We must not let the United Nations go the way of the League of Nations. We must fulfil our common vision of a peaceful and just post-cold-war world." (S/PV.2963, p. 6)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Cyprus for his kind words addressed to me.

I call on the representative of Greece.

Mr. EXARCHOS (Greece): It gives me great pleasure to offer you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. I wish to assure you of our total confidence that you will discharge with success the important duties vested in that high office.

I take this opportunity also to extend sincere and warm congratulations to your predecessor in the chair, the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Thomas Pickering, for the skill and leadership he displayed in the exercise of his duties last month.

I cannot fail to express my Government's sincere thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his perseverance and dedication in the face of difficult obstacles he encounters as he carries out his mission of good offices.

Our thanks also go to the Secretary-General's Special Representative in Cyprus, Mr. Camilión, and to Mr. Feissel, Director in the Office of the Secretary-General, for their invaluable contribution to the ongoing negotiating process.

I wish also to express appreciation to Force Commander Clive Milner for the manner in which he has been carrying out his delicate mission, and to the Force's military and civilian personnel for the devotion they have demonstrated in the performance of their duties.

The Greek Government has concurred in the extension of the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for another six months, as decided by the Security Council, having taken note of the agreement

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

to that effect of the Government of Cyprus, exercising its exclusive and sovereign right with respect to this matter. My Government also considers that, in view of the prevailing conditions in Cyprus, there should be a renewal of the mandate of UNFICYP, which continues to play - and we share the Secretary-General's opinion on this - an indispensable role.

As we all know, the peace-keeping force is performing a wide range of tasks, and there have been cases in which it has faced difficult or delicate situations. This give me the opportunity to express, on behalf of my Government, sincere appreciation to the Governments of the troop-contributing countries for their continuing commitment to the cause of peace in Cyprus and for having undertaken a heavy financial burden, without which the very existence of UNFICYP would be at stake.

That is why I would like to express, on behalf of my Government, the hope that next week the Council will be able to adopt a resolution which would resolve the chronic financial crisis facing UNFICYP by changing its method of financing from voluntary to assessed contributions, as is the case with all other United Nations peace-keeping operations.

Allow me to reiterate at this point my Government's pledge to maintain the level of its total contribution at the present voluntary amount of $800,000 per annum, even if a new system were to bring its assessed contribution down to a lower level.

Regarding the conclusions of the Secretariat review team concerning the operations and organization of UNFICYP mentioned in paragraph 44 of the Secretary-General's report (S/21981), dated 7 December, allow me to express my Government's concern that the proposed reduction of infantry battalions from four to three should in no way reduce the effectiveness of the Force. We would,

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

therefore, ask for the Secretary-General's assurance in this respect before any relevant decision is adopted.

We have been witnessing historic events in the world during the last two years, events that have also contributed, as we have witnessed in recent months, to the strengthening of the effectiveness of the Council. However, this new effectiveness of the Council has not yet had any results on the resolution of the Cyprus problem. Sixteen years after Turkey invaded Cyprus, the relevant United Nations resolutions have yet to be implemented, and, consequently, the occupying forces continue to control more than one-third of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus. It is therefore indispensable that the Council assume a more active role in the search for a solution to this problem and towards contributing more effectively to the Secretary-General's ongoing efforts.

Nine months have passed since the Council unanimously adopted resolution 649 (1990), after witnessing the complete collapse of the Secretary-General's efforts to breathe new life into the intercommunal talks last March. The reasons for the failure of those talks are well known and are clearly set out in the Secretary-General's report of 8 March 1990. In this document (S/21183), it is stated that Mr. Denktash's insistence that the term "communities" be used in a manner that is synonymous with the term "peoples", each having a separate right to "self-determination", created an impasse of a substantive kind, which raised questions regarding the essence of the Secretary-General's mandate of good offices.

The Security Council, to which the Secretary-General turned for guidance, rejected, and rightly so, this attempt to change the basis of the talks; it did so by means of its resolution 649 (1990), which, inter alia, formally excluded any form of partition or secession in the case of Cyprus. Nine months after this resolution was adopted, the impasse still persists, and may indeed have

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

deteriorated, owing, again, to Mr. Denktash's unwillingness to renounce his intransigent views and because of various provocative actions by the Turkish authorities.

Thus, last July, as is mentioned in paragraph 17 of the Secretary-General's report, the Turkish occupation forces handed over control of Varosha, the new town of Famagusta, to the so-called "Turkish-Cypriot Security Forces", a development which could lead to the eventual settlement of the area by people other than its inhabitants. This action compelled the President of the Security Council, in his statement of July 19 (S/21400) to express the concern of the members of the Council over any action which contravenes paragraph 5 of resolution 550 (1984). This paragraph clearly states that the Security Council

> "Considers attempts to settle any part of Varosha by people other than its inhabitants as inadmissible and calls for the transfer of that area to the administration of the United Nations".

In total disregard of the aforementioned statement of the President of the Security Council and of paragraphs 5 of resolutions 550 (1984) and 649 (1990), Mr. Denktash, in an interview he gave on 28 November, stated that he planned to settle 350 Palestinian students in the city of Varosha, and added that the closure of the city had been a mistake, that it was now in ruins because it had been left uninhabited.

Turkey also signed a so-called agreement with the pseudo-State providing for the abolition of passport requirements and for a customs union between Turkey and those parts of the Republic of Cyprus still occupied by Turkish military forces. Apart from the obvious disregard for the relevant resolutions, resolutions (541 (1983), 550 (1984) and even 649 (1990), this so-called agreement clearly contravenes the provisions of the association agreement between the European Economic Community (EEC) and Cyprus, as well as the one between the EEC and Turkey.

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

These actions by Turkey, as well as the recent threats by Mr. Denktash and his partitionist administration to colonize Varosha, do not contribute at all to a successful outcome of the Secretary-General's current efforts. On the contrary, they undermine the agreed basis of the intercommunal negotiations, thus jeopardizing the efforts of the Secretary-General and further aggravating the already grave situation in Cyprus.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Greece for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is Mr. Ozer Koray, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. KORAY: Mr. President, I should like to thank you and, through you, the other members of the Security Council for giving me this opportunity to address the Council on the subject of the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for a further period of six months.

I should also like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of December. I am confident that your well-known diplomatic experience will be invaluable in guiding the deliberations of this body to constructive results.

My congratulations go also to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the United States, for the skilful manner in which he conducted the Council's work during the exceptionally busy month of November.

The Security Council remains seized of the situation in Cyprus and of the efforts of the Secretary-General in pursuit of his mission of good offices. I shall therefore refrain from going into the details of all the developments which have taken place since the high-level meeting in New York in February and March 1990, which, unfortunately, failed to produce a favourable outcome owing to the refusal of the Greek Cypriot leader to discuss our proposals and suggestions for a comprehensive settlement and his outright rejection of even the most basic guiding principles of equality, bizonality and true partnership based on friendly relations and mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and integrity.

(Mr. Koray)

I shall, however, touch upon three important issues which continue to threaten the delicate situation in Cyprus in the most profound way.

First, the prospects for a negotiated settlement were dealt a major setback by the unilateral Greek Cypriot application for membership of the European Community. We had warned in advance that any one-sided step that would fundamentally alter the future of Cyprus without reference to the Turkish Cypriot side would be considered a rejection of any kind of partnership with us and would therefore deal a serious blow to the negotiations. It will also be recalled that the Secretary-General had issued a statement in this regard saying that application for membership of the European Community was among the issues to be discussed, within the context of an overall agreement, between the two leaders. For having made that statement, the Secretary-General was accused by those in some Greek Cypriot quarters of overstepping his powers.

I should like to underscore our firm stance in this matter. The Turkish Cypriot side will not allow any encroachment on its sovereignty, or the negation of its equal political status. While the Greek Cypriot side is vigorously denying the Turkish Cypriot people the exercise of its inalienable right freely to determine its future, it has the audacity to submit an application for the whole of Cyprus. It purports to represent the will of both peoples, under the pretentious and illegal title of Republic of Cyprus, when it is nothing more than a Greek Cypriot State representing the Greek Cypriot people only. This hypocrisy distorts all the existing realities and cripples the principles which form the basis of the negotiations on a genuine partnership. The title role which the Greek Cypriots have assumed cannot make them the owners of the island as a whole. Having said that, I should like to express the hope that, in line with the call made by the Secretary-General in his statement of 11 September 1990, the European Commission will refrain from taking any action on the one-sided application of the Greek

(Mr. Koray)

Cypriots pending an overall agreement, to be negotiated by the two sides, which should cover all aspects of the issue.

Secondly, there is the issue of the economic and other restrictions imposed on northern Cyprus. The war of attrition waged against the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriot administration over the last 27 years has had devastating effects on the prospects of rapprochement between the two peoples. The longstanding Greek Cypriot antagonism against the Turkish Cypriots is manifested in the perpetuation of an all-out embargo in the economic, social, cultural and other fields. The most recent example of this ugly policy was the illegal arrest of a Danish captain by the Greek Cypriot police at Larnaca port on the grounds that his vessel had previously called at one of the Turkish Cypriot ports. There have been many other cases of such illegal arrests and arbitrary sentencing of foreigners in the south over the last 15 years. The harassment of foreign tourists bearing in their passports Turkish Cypriot entry stamps also continues to be daily routine in south Cyprus. Paragraph 15 of the Secretary-General's latest report (S/21981 and Add.1) provides another example of the Greek Cypriot side closing the Ledra Palace border checkpoint to bar tourists from crossing over to the north from the south.

The world is being punished unjustly by an illegitimate régime, through an array of capricious measures, for having any kind of dealings with northern Cyprus. Such measures go a long way, even to the extent of the Greek Cypriots punishing their own citizens for attempting to engage in commerce with the Turkish Cypriots. In the village of Pile, which is the only mixed village situated on the buffer zone between south and north Cyprus, the inhabitants have been under a virtual siege for the past two years. In paragraph 32 of the Secretary-General's report the Greek Cypriot police are clearly pinpointed as the culprits in Pile. The Greek Cypriot police have prevented freedom of movement by setting up

(Mr. Koray)

road-blocks and effectively intercepting and arresting anyone found in possession of goods purchased from the Turkish Cypriots. Several weeks ago, for instance, a Greek Cypriot was arrested for the serious crime of buying snails from a Turkish Cypriot. The Greek Cypriot daily Filelefheros of 27 November reported that a total of 316 arrests, detentions and interceptions took place in 1989 alone.

It is pertinent to note that while the Greek Cypriot administration pays lip service to establishing closer relations between the two peoples, actually all their efforts are directed towards a complete blockade and oppression of the Turkish Cypriot people.

Thirdly, the frantic rearmament efforts of the Greek Cypriot side are not conducive to peace, but are a constant source of tension in the island. This rearmament is totally inconsistent with the spirit of negotiations and is a most serious violation of paragraph 5 of resolution 649 (1990). Mr. Vassiliou has accumulated a significant arsenal of sophisticated weapons and equipment by spending around $1 million per day on military purchases. That magnitude of expenditure, by the admission of none other than the Greek Cypriot Defence Minister, Mr. Aloneftis, is, proportionately, one of the highest in the world. Coupled with the conscription of women and the measures taken towards enabling complete mobilization, the Vassiliou administration seems to be bent on resort to armed violence.

(Mr. Koray)

The oft-repeated warmongering rhetoric of the Greek Cypriot Defence Minister continues to make headlines in Greek Cypriot newspapers. Mentally, and from the point of view of its behaviour, the Greek Cypriot community is already in a state of war. Suffice it to say at this stage that we are closely monitoring the developments. The Secretary-General has also been kept informed of this festering situation. We should have liked to see included in the Secretary-General's latest report a clearer call upon the Greek Cypriot side to desist from such an arming frenzy.

With regard to the clumsy and unwarranted attempts by the Greek Cypriot leadership which purport to draw parallels between the situations in Kuwait and Cyprus, I should like to draw the attention of the Council to an article written by the Editor-in-Chief of the Greek Cypriot daily Filelefttheros, Mr. Stavros Angelides. Mr. Angelides writes:

> "Iraq openly occupied Kuwait, but Turkey arrived in Cyprus because of the upset constitutional order in the island. We [the Greek Cypriots] are responsible for this."

Mr. Angelides then goes on to explain how the constitutional order in Cyprus was destroyed in accordance with the notorious Akritas plan, and with the concurrence of all Greek Cypriot leaders at the time. He reminds his readers of the 1974 coup d'état and the invasion of Cyprus by Greece, culminating in the violent efforts to achieve the forcible annexation of the island to Greece, before the legal intervention of Turkey took place as a necessary move to protect the Turkish Cypriots and the independence of the island. Mr. Angelides concludes with the following observation:

> "With the passage of time, we forget, or ignore deliberately, the past events which have created the present realities in Cyprus. In the course of time, we

(Mr. Koray)

forget our mistakes and call on others to observe justice in the same way that we ourselves understand it. We make generalizations about the UN resolutions and only refer to those suiting our own interest."

As a footnote, let me add that Mr. Angelides is referring here, of course, to the rejection of Security Council resolution 649 (1990) by the Greek Cypriot side. But if there is in fact a similarity between the situations in Kuwait and in Cyprus, the similarity could only stem from the fact that in 1974, Greece was playing Iraq's role in the present Gulf crisis and Turkey was assuming a position equivalent to what the whole world is trying to achieve today - that is to say, to repel aggression and to reverse the annexation of Kuwait.

In this connection, I should also like to quote from the letter addressed by the British Foreign Office to a number of Greek Cypriot organizations in which it attempted to draw a comparison between Kuwait and Cyprus. The letter states:

"Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was an unprovoked attack on its neighbour leading to proclaimed annexation of the whole State. The Turkish military intervention in Cyprus was preceded by the military coup ... intended to bring about a declaration of the union of Cyprus and Greece."

The Greek Cypriot side often complains that, while a number of regional disputes are being resolved all around the world, the Cyprus question still remains unsettled. It tends to forget, however, that in all disputes which have been peacefully settled there exists a common denominator: the two sides to the issue accept each other as equals in all respects and there is mutual recognition of and respect for each other's sovereign rights. That common denominator does not exist in Cyprus and its absence is precisely the reason for the prolongation of the issue.

(Mr. Koray)

Today we rejoice at the unification of Germany and of Yemen and are heartened by the improved relations between North and South Korea and by the prospects of the reconciliation of the Korean people. Let us ask ourselves how it was possible for these countries to transform their relations, characterized by many years of conflict and tension, into genuine co-operation and partnership at an astounding pace. The answer is simple. Each of the peoples that who were forcibly separated into two states along ideological and/or artificial lines was part of the same nation. In Cyprus, however, there exist two separate peoples that have no common ethnic, linguistic, cultural or religious bonds. The emergence of two states in Cyprus is the direct result of the violent struggle of one people to dominate the other by force of arms. In consequence, the two peoples have been living independently of each other for the last 27 years.

In the case of Germany and Yemen, unification talks began only after the relations between the respective sides had been normalized through recognition of and mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and independence. The Greek Cypriots should draw lessons from these historic developments and adopt the policy of rapprochement towards Northern Cyprus, with a view to facilitating a relationship based on mutual agreement and co-operation on the way to a federation in the future. In the absence of a new and realistic pattern of relationship between the two states in Cyprus, I fear that the prospect for a federal settlement will remain bleak.

The question of missing persons in Cyprus - which the Greek Cypriots insist on exploiting for political propaganda purposes - has cropped up yet again before this body as well as before Main Committees of the General Assembly. The Turkish Cypriot side sees no useful purpose in the protraction of this humanitarian issue, which has been the subject of an ill-motivated campaign for much longer than the

(Mr. Koray)

relatives of the missing persons can tolerate. The first priority should now be given to removing the grievances of the relatives of missing persons by putting an end to the flow of deceitful statements pertaining to this issue.

The best course of action, as proposed by President Denktash, would be the issuance of a joint statement by the leaders of the two peoples acknowledging in good faith that all missing persons have to be presumed dead since no evidence exists to the contrary and since even Mr. Vassiliou admitted, in Amsterdam last July, that all the missing persons are dead. I wish to reiterate this call on the Greek Cypriot leadership, as it is the only realistic approach in this regard.

I should also like to touch upon a matter which has been exploited by the Greek Cypriot side - namely, the status of Varosha. In view of the artificial storm created by the disinformation campaign on the subject, I should like to restate the Turkish Cypriot position on Varosha which I explained three years ago, on 14 December 1987, at a meeting of the Security Council:

> "At the outset, let me restate and make it perfectly clear ... that Varosha is part and parcel of the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The status of Varosha is not different from that of any other area of our Republic. It is only the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus that has full and exclusive jurisdiction and sovereignty over Varosha. And I should also remind the Greek Cypriot side and others that causing false confusion over irrelevant matters will not warrant any alteration in the status of Varosha." (S/PV.2771, p. 43)

The position of the Turkish Cypriot side on this matter remains unchanged. We reject once again all Greek Cypriot claims over Varosha as untenable and highly provocative.

(Mr. Koray)

A few weeks from now, I shall be handing over my duties as the representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. During the six years that I have served my country at the United Nations, some of the developments shaping the negotiations between the two sides in Cyprus, under the auspices of the Secretary-General, have been significant, and it is worth while recalling them now. Six years ago, when I assumed this post, the whole world was closely watching the hopeful developments which led to the summit meeting between President Denktash and Mr. Kyprianou in January 1985. The Turkish Cypriot side had concurred in a United Nations draft joint high-level agreement and had agreed to the convening of the summit meeting to sign it, only to discover that Mr. Kyprianou was to back off at the last minute, rejecting everything that was presented to the two sides. At the time, everybody except the Greek Cypriot leaders expressed disappointment over the loss of a historic opportunity for reaching a final settlement.

The Secretary-General then continued his contacts with the two sides and, after months of arduous work, the draft framework agreement of 29 March 1968 was presented to the two sides for approval. The Turkish Cypriot side accepted the draft *in toto*, but Mr. Kyprianou, once again, dashed all hopes for a settlement by rejecting the document. Mr. Kyprianou's intransigence was compounded by his campaign in international forums to vilify and further isolate the people of North Cyprus.

The results of the 1988 elections in South Cyprus brought about a change in the leadership of the Greek Cypriot administration. The glimmer of hope which emerged with the elimination of Mr. Kyprianou was soon to fade away when it became apparent that there was no change in the Greek Cypriot mentality *vis-à-vis* the Cyprus issue. Fresh rounds of talks which were initiated between the two sides under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General produced no positive

(Mr. Koray)

results as the new Greek Cypriot leader refused to acknowledge the political equality, the partnership rights and the right to self-determination of the Turkish Cypriot people.

At this critical juncture it is regrettable that, after all these years, countries are still refraining from according equal treatment to the two States in Cyprus. This is certainly not helping the Secretary-General in his mission of good offices. The sooner the community of nations begin to grant this equal treatment to the two sides, the better will be the chances of an early settlement. Our endeavours to promote a peaceful settlement can be successful only if there is an even-handed approach that will promote reconciliation and settlement in the island. Otherwise, the Greek Cypriot side will continue to wreck the efforts in this direction by setting pre-conditions, no matter who is heading the Greek Cypriot administration.

Turning now to the question of the extension of the mandate of UNFICYP, I would like to restate that the resolution which has just been adopted by the Security Council is unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side for the reasons that were outlined in previous Security Council debates on this matter. Any resolution which refers to the Greek Cypriot administration as the "Government of Cyprus" is unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side because such resolutions ignore the existing realities in Cyprus and attempt to negate the principle of equality between the two sides.

Notwithstanding its unavoidable rejection of the present resolution, the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is nevertheless favourably disposed to accept the presence of UNFICYP on the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, on the same basis as that stated in June 1990. Thus, our position continues to be that the principle, the scope, the modalities and

(Mr. Koray)

procedures of co-operation between the authorities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and UNFICYP shall be based only on decisions which shall be taken solely by the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

In this connection, I would like to point out that the present mandate of UNFICYP is not compatible with the radically changed conditions and circumstances of today. In the light of the present realities in Cyprus, and the new approach spelt out in Security Council resolution 649 (1990), we believe that a reappraisal of UNFICYP's mandate is necessary. This would not only be in response to prevailing circumstances but also in keeping with the decision to reach a settlement that would be based on the equality of the two parties.

I wish to thank the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts and to renew my Government's support for the mission of good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General entrusted to him by the Security Council. I would also like to reiterate my Government's readiness to co-operate with the Secretary-General in accordance with Security Council resolution 649 (1990). The Turkish Cypriot side considers this resolution a step in the right direction which could constitute a fresh starting-point for future negotiations on an equal footing. The Council's resolution has set out important ground rules for the process of negotiations and the conduct of relations between the two sides in Cyprus by confirming the legal and political equality of the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots. In keeping with resolution 649 (1990), we urge the Greek Cypriots to return to the negotiating table in order to reach freely a mutually acceptable settlement that would be a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation as stipulated by that resolution.

(Mr. Koray)

Finally, we commend the efforts and invaluable contributions of the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General in Cyprus, Mr. Oscar Camilión, and of Director Gustave Feissel. We also commend Under-Secretary-General Marrack Goulding and the Force Commander, Major General Clive Milner, for their successful guidance of UNFICYP.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank Mr. Koray for the kind words he addressed to me.

I now call on the representative of Turkey.

Mr. AKSIN (Turkey): I wish to extend to you my warm congratulations on your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. Your long experience in the United Nations and your well-known diplomatic skill will help bring success to the work of the Council during this month.

I would also like to pay a tribute to your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Pickering, for the effective manner in which he conducted the work of the Council as President, at a time when fateful decisions were being taken by the Council.

The resolution which has just been adopted, extending the mandate of UNFICYP for another six months, cannot be accepted by my Government for reasons well known to the Council. Our position is in full agreement with the position of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, as explained by its representative, Mr. Koray.

The reference made in the resolution to the "Government of Cyprus" is incorrect, because at present, there is no Government of Cyprus. The Government in the southern part of the island, which has appropriated that title, represents only the Greek Cypriot community. The resolution fails to acknowledge the existence in the northern part of the island, since 1983, of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. This State was established by the Turkish Cypriot people because no

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

people can remain stateless indefinitely. At present, the Turkish Cypriots are negotiating with the Greek Cypriots for the purpose of establishing a federation with them. The basis for these negotiations and the nature of the federation to be formed is described in resolution 649 (1990).

In this resolution, the Security Council calls upon the two sides, inter alia, to co-operate, on an equal footing, with the Secretary-General, to reach the sought objective. Given that the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots are to negotiate and to decide on the nature of their future political partnership, it is logically impossible, before the conclusion of the negotiations, to make any reference to a single government of Cyprus representing all the inhabitants of the island. The truth of the matter is that there are two administrations in Cyprus, each representing exclusively its own community. It is high time to introduce the concept of the full political equality of the two communities in Cyprus into all the resolutions of the United Nations, including those dealing with the mandate of UNFICYP. My Government would have liked to see this properly reflected in the resolution adopted today.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

Turkey supports the political equality of the Turkish Cypriot people and its right to determine its own future. Turkey will continue to help protect the legitimate rights and the freedom of the Turkish Cypriots and will not allow their security to become endangered.

Turkey stands for a comprehensive and lasting settlement in Cyprus. We believe that this can only be achieved through negotiations between the two peoples of the island within the framework of the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General. Security Council resolution 649 (1990) has identified the principles and concepts on which a settlement will be based. This resolution has also provided the methods to be followed for reaching a settlement. We are gratified to know that the Turkish Cypriot leadership supports resolution 649 (1990). My Government also supports this resolution and appeals to the other parties concerned to give it their unequivocal support. In particular, we would like to draw attention to operative paragraph 5 of the resolution, which calls on the parties to refrain from action that could aggravate the situation.

Developments following the last meeting of the Council on the question of Cyprus have not been encouraging. The Greek Cypriot side, with no regard for the good offices mission of the Secretary-General, and in defiance of all appeals not to aggravate the situation, continued its campaign to vilify and isolate the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and stepped up its attempts to internationalize the Cyprus issue. The Greek Cypriot action of applying for membership of the European Community, in total disregard of the Turkish Cypriots, can be cited as a complete rejection of the principles governing the negotiations within the framework of resolution 649 (1990). The action of the Greek Cypriots in applying for European Community membership for Cyprus without reference to the Turkish Cypriots is a denial of the principles of partnership and political equality. Without these principles, a federation is inconceivable.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

The Greek Cypriot rearmament effort is incompatible with the current efforts to create an atmosphere of trust and good will in Cyprus. It also violates paragraph 5 of resolution 649 (1990) by seriously aggravating the already tense situation on the island.

It is a strange paradox that, while the Greek Cypriots continue their hostile activities directed at the Turkish Cypriots, they have also been calling for unilateral gestures of good will from the Turkish side. These gestures have been demanded as a pre-condition for resuming the negotiations. Another Greek Cypriot pre-condition for resuming the negotiations is that the Turkish Cypriots must renounce some of their basic rights, including their right to self-determination.

Such hard-line policies do nothing to further the prospects for an early resumption of the talks, nor is Greece being helpful in breaking out of the present deadlock. On the contrary, Athens is encouraging the Greek Cypriots in their intransigent stance. Earlier this week the spokesman for the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressed the concern of Turkey over the statements made by Prime Minister Mitsotakis and Mr. Vasiliou at their joint press conference in Athens. The spokesman for the Ministry said that it would be good for Greece to stop hedging, declare its support for resolution 649 (1990) and encourage the Greek Cypriots to carry out their responsibilities in accordance with this resolution. The spokesman also said that Greece should stop its provocative claims that Cyprus is a Greek island, declare that it has given up its quest for _enosis_ and that it regards Cyprus as the common home of the two equal communities living there. The spokesman added:

"that none of this was done is disappointing, and from the point of view of the efforts of the Secretary-General, disturbing".

A settlement in Cyprus requires of both parties good intentions, fairness, respect for the principle of equality and, above all, the will to overcome

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

differences. We sincerely hope that the Greek Cypriots will be able to bring themselves to adopt such a frame of mind so as to achieve the desired end. They should heed the appeals of the Secretary-General and seek the path of reconciliation and enter into negotiations in good faith.

Before I conclude my statement I would like to quote from a speech delivered by the President of my country, Mr. Turgut Ozal, on the occasion of the awarding by the University of Izmir in Turkey of an honorary doctorate to Mr. Andreas Politakis, a Greek intellectual dedicated to the cause of friendship between Turkey and Greece. In this speech President Ozal referred to differences between Greece and Turkey and to the need to settle those differences through dialogue. He also referred to closer co-operation between the two countries and to the need to avoid creating new problems and working against the interests of one another. After this, President Ozal said,

"Obviously, we cannot ignore the significant changes taking place in our region and throughout the world when we look at the future of our relations.

"I am convinced that these changes and the new conditions taking shape in our region will bring us closer to one another and lead us into adopting new positions by discarding the obsessions of the past.

"I would also like to underline the following point.

"The Turkish and Greek nations have extensions beyond their own countries. Obviously I am referring here to Cyprus. We are keen to see the two peoples of the island breaking away from today's atmosphere of political conflict and moving in the direction of a new constructive relationship. As one of the three Guarantor Powers, Turkey is ready to do what it can to help. We wish to see Greece taking a similar approach. We believe that the two mother countries should encourage moderate, just and realistic policies so that a new relationship between the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

can emerge. It is essential not to repeat past mistakes. The two sides in the island should try to come to terms with one another as equals and they should put an end to all activities that are incompatible with this goal. We cannot believe that the road to a settlement passes through rearmament, embargoes or the exploitation of the question at the international level. A settlement has to be sought through the establishment of a constructive relationship between the two sides."

I would like to recall once again that my Government will continue to give its full support to the Secretary-General in carrying out his mission of good offices. My Government will continue to co-operate with the Secretary-General to secure an early resumption of the intercommunal talks. Finally, my Government will also continue to support the Turkish Cypriots in their efforts to secure the resumption of the intercommunal talks without pre-conditions.

I would not like to conclude without expressing our gratitude to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Oscar Camilión, for his patient efforts; to Major-General Clive Milner, Commander of UNFICYP, for his dedicated services; and to Director Gustave Feissel for his hard work. They have all contributed significantly to the pursuit of the mission of the Secretary-General. Of course, our deepest debt of gratitude goes to the Secretary-General himself for his total commitment to a fair and lasting solution in Cyprus. We wish him success in his delicate task and promise him our full support once again.

I had intended to end my statement at this point, but some of the allegations made by the speakers who have preceded me require me to address these points very briefly. There was a reference to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and the Helsinki Final Act with the implication that European principles are being violated in Cyprus today.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

How strange that it should be the Greek Cypriots who raise this point. Do they really think that the world has forgotten that for 11 grim years they violated every human right of the Turkish Cypriots? Do they think that their systematic efforts to destroy the Turkish Cypriots politically, economically and, yes, even physically have been forgotten? The authors of the carnage that went on from 1963 to 1974 in Cyprus are the last people to pose as defenders of human rights and lecture others about respect for European standards.

We also heard references to foreign occupation in Cyprus. Need I remind the Council that there is a full regiment from mainland Greece in southern Cyprus? That, in addition, there is a massive presence of officers and personnel from the Greek Army in the so-called Cypriot National Guard? And that even the commander of the force is an officer from mainland Greece? Are these not foreign troops or has enosis taken place already without our being aware of it?

There was also an attempt to cast doubts on the Turkish Cypriot State. This has been done before, and I have had to respond before. I am sorry for sounding repetitive, but I must refer to a previous statement of mine when I said that

> "the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus has all the attributes of a State, including population, territory and sovereignty. It has all the institutions that a properly constituted State should have. Furthermore, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is a country of laws. It is democratic and pluralistic and is an open society. Its citizens enjoy all human rights and freedoms. In the recent past these citizens have fought repeatedly to preserve their freedom and dignity against the racist onslaughts of the Greek side. They have succeeded against all odds in creating a model State. Turkey is proud to recognize the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus as an independent State - because that is what it is." (2898th meeting, p. 41)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I call on the representative of Cyprus.

Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus): I will begin with Turkey's rejection of the resolution just adopted. I only want to remark that Turkey is now in very good company - Iraq has also been rejecting resolutions of the Security Council. It is a law unto itself.

But why should we be surprised? The very last words that we heard from the representative of Turkey again run counter to resolutions of the Council - resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984), which deals directly with the exchange of Ambassadors between Turkey and the pseudo-State that Turkey now alleges has all the attributes of a State. There is a small difference between Turkey and Iraq. Turkey is the more moderate: it did not occupy the whole of Cyprus; it only occupied 40 per cent of it, whereas Iraq occupied the whole of Kuwait. But they are alike because neither of them recognizes the Government of the other country.

Now, on rearmament, which was mentioned again, I am not going to speak again of the defensive nature of the armed forces of the Republic of Cyprus and the offensive nature of Turkey's own armed forces. I am not even going to repeat that Turkey boasts the second largest army in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, an army that numbers more than the total population of Cyprus.

I am going to tell the representative of Turkey something else. The Minister of Defence is quite prepared to accept verification by the United Nations. Are they - and I am not talking about Turkey but its forces in Cyprus - prepared to accept verification? Let them come out and tell us about it.

Secondly, as regards our obligation to the European Community, one would not have expected Turkey to respect the sovereign equality of States - namely, Turkey and Cyprus - but it should have respected the decision of the Council of Ministers of the Community, the very Community to which it has applied to join. A

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

reply to what it said was given by the Council of Ministers of the European Community.

We hear so much about Security Council resolution 649 (1990) that I am forced not only to remind the representative of Turkey of the raison d'être of that resolution but to reread its most important paragraph, paragraph 1, which

> "Reaffirms in particular its resolution 367 (1975) as well as its support for the 1977 and 1979 high-level agreements between the leaders of the two communities in which they pledged themselves to establish a bi-communal Federal Republic of Cyprus that will safeguard its independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-alignment, and exclude union in whole or in part with any other country and any form of partition or secession".

If this is not yet more disregard for a mandatory Security Council resolution, I do not know what it is.

Concerning violations of human rights, we said earlier that when any country or individual speaks about human rights, Turkey should keep silent. Everybody knows the record of that country, beginning with genocide, and the three successive findings of one of the most respected human rights bodies, the European Commission on Human Rights, to which Turkey belongs, about violations of every right in the book, from murder to rape. Where is there reference to violations of human rights by the Greek Cypriots?

To put it in a nutshell, all this denotes that there is no serious intention either to abandon the present stance or to negotiate for a solution based on principles.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I call on the representative of Greece.

Mr. EXARCHOS (Greece): Frankly, I regret taking up the Council's time, but since the representative of Turkey has referred directly to Greece by invoking Security Council resolution 649 (1990), may I in turn remind him that the same resolution also reaffirms all previous United Nations resolutions on Cyprus and reiterates in its first operative paragraph the exclusion of union in whole or in part with any other country and any form of partition or seccession, thus reiterating and reaffirming Security Council resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984), which declare the Turkish Cypriot unilateral declaration of independence illegal and call for its withdrawal.

If Turkey were fully to implement resolution 649 (1990), it would enormously facilitate the ongoing efforts of the Secretary-General to find a solution to the Cyprus problem within the framework of his mission of good offices. And I would like to add that the Secretary-General's last report on his mission of good offices in Cyprus, of 7 November 1990, mentions that the discussion that his colleagues had had since mid-October in Nicosia could not be completed before the preparation of that report nor was it possible to cover all the hearings during those talks. His next report on the current efforts will be submitted by 15 February next year.

We indeed hope that the existing stalemate will have been broken by then, and that substantial progress will have been achieved. That can only happen if Turkey accepts to go along with an agreed solution to the problem of Cyprus by peaceful means within the framework of the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General in keeping with the rules governing United Nations bodies. Greece, for its part, will continue to give its full support, in close co-operation with the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, to the Secretary-General's ongoing mission of good offices.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I call on the representative of Turkey.

Mr. AKSIN (Turkey): I am not going to prolong this debate by attempting to answer some of the allegations coming from the Greek Cypriot side. But, with reference to my colleague from Greece, I would like to ask him to remember that the question of Cyprus is going to be settled by the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots, not by Greece or by Turkey. We can only be helpful, and we can encourage. We are not participants; we are not even direct parties to the conflict. I just wanted to remind him of that.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): There are no further speakers on my list.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.